



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/015,604

12/17/2001

Shinichiro Hamada

217398US2RD

5932

22850 7590 12/22/2006
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.
1940 DUKE STREET
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER

DEBROW, JAMES J

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2176

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
--	-----------	---------------

3 MONTHS

12/22/2006

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/015,604

Applicant(s)

HAMADA ET AL.

Examiner

James J. Debrow

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 November 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 2, 4-7, 9-12, 14 and 15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 2, 4-7, 9-12, 14 and 15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Request For Continued Examination (RCE) filed 07 Nov. 2006.
2. Claims 1, 2, 4-7, 9-12, 14, and 15 are pending in this case. Claims 1, 6, and 11 are independent claims.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

3. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 07 Nov. 2006 has been entered.

Applicant Response

4. In Applicant's Response dated 07 Nov. 2006, Applicant amended claims 1, 6, and 11, and argued against all rejections previously set forth in the Office Action.

Specification

5. The disclosure is objected to because it contains an embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code. Applicant is required to delete the embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code. See MPEP § 608.01.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

7. **Claims 1, 2, 4-7, 9-12, 14, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Silva et al. (hereinafter “Silva”), US 6,976,210 B1 provisional filed 8/31/1999.**

Regarding independent claims 1, 6, and 11, Silva discloses extracting one or a plurality of partial documents from the first documents according to locations of the first documents on the Internet and ranges of the partial documents to be extracted in fig. 2, 6-8, col. 5 line 22 – col. 8 line 21, and col. 11 line 35 – col. 12 line 3. Silva discloses wherein the locations of the first document and the ranges of the partial document to be

Art Unit: 2176

extracted are described by the specific markup language and included in the second document in col. 9 lines 16-26. Silva discloses that the markup expression for extracting the partial documents is stored in the Web view composite display document. Silva discloses inserting the partial documents extracted by the extracting step into the second document to generate a document structure containing original document structures of the first and second documents according to insertion positions of the partial documents on the second document in fig. 2, 6-8, and col. 8 line 66 – col. 9 line 15. Silva discloses wherein the insertion positions are described by the specific markup language in the second document in col. 9 lines 16-26. Silva discloses converting the document structure generated by the inserting step into a desired document structure according to ranges of the second document to be converted including the partial documents inserted by the inserting step and identification information of a file describing a conversion rule for converting the document structure into the desired document structure, the ranges of the second document to be converted and the identification information described by the specific markup language and included in the second document in fig. 2, col. 7 line 16 – col. 8 line 14, and col. 9 lines 16-26. Silva teaches that the parser can correct, or convert, the tag structure into the desired structure in col. 7 lines 47-52. Therefore Silva teaches converting a current document structure into a desired document structure.

Regarding dependent claims 2, 7, and 12, Silva discloses wherein the second document is described by using at least a tag for describing the locations of the first documents on the Internet and the ranges of the partial documents to be extracted in

Art Unit: 2176

fig. 2 and col. 5 line 22 – col. 8 line 14. Silva discloses wherein the second document is described by using at least a tag for describing specifying the insertion positions of the partial documents on the second document in fig. 2 and col. 8 line 66 – col. 9 line 15.

Regarding dependent claims 4, 9, and 14, Silva discloses using at least a tag for specifying the ranges for which the document structure of the second document is to be converted and describing the identification information of the file describing the conversion rule in fig. 2, col. 5 line 65 – col. 6 line 29, col. 7 line 16 – col. 8 line 14, and col. 9 lines 16-26.

Regarding dependent claims 5, 10, and 15, Silva discloses wherein the second document is described by Extensible Markup Language (XML), and when the first documents are not described by the XML, the extracting step extracts the partial documents from the first documents after converting the first documents into a description format according to the XML in col. 7 line 16 – col. 8 line 14.

Note

8. It is noted that any citations to specific, pages, columns, lines, or figures in the prior art references and any interpretation of the reference should not be considered to be limiting in any way. A reference is relevant for all it contains and may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art.

See, MPEP 2123.

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments filed 07 Nov. 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues *Silva et al. fails to teach or suggest "... the locations of the first document and the ranges of the partial documents to be extracted ... included in the second document," "... the insertion positions ... included in the second document" and "... the ranges of the second document to be converted and the identification information ... included in the second document," as recited in Claim 1.*

The Examiner disagrees.

Silva teaches a Web view manager, which provides the user with the ability to specify how the resulting information from the source Web pages will be physically arranged in the browser (col. 5, lines 3-.27). The Web view is a set of Web clippings each derived for a source Web page. The Web view is a set of Web clippings each derived for a source Web page. Silva teaches the Web view (*second document*) may be specified such as specifying the XY coordinates (*insertion position*) of where the information within the clipping is to be placed. A default layout can also be specified in which the system determines the best fit to place the Web clipping in the Web view (col. 9, lines 1-.15). Silva further teaches that by parsing the displayed page (*first document*),

Art Unit: 2176

the parser generates a document object model of the source Web page in which elements are uniquely identifiable (*identification information*). Through the GUI, the user can select the parsed elements from the document object model tree that is to be included in the second document. Since the document object model elements are uniquely identifiable in a Web page, the selected expression can use the document object model address to define which corresponding piece of the Web page that is to be extracted by the extractor. The Examiner interprets the Web view display as the second document.

It is noted that any citations to specific, pages, columns, lines, or figures in the prior art references and any interpretation of the reference should not be considered to be limiting in any way. A reference is relevant for all it contains and may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art.

See, MPEP 2123.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James J. Debrow whose telephone number is 571-272-5768. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on 571-272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JAMES DEBROW
EXAMINER
ART UNIT 2176


Heather R. Herndon
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2100